

Washington continues to be that taxpayers' dollars are wasted on low-priority, redundant or unnecessary programs. The dollars in fraud, waste, and abuse total billions annually.

The basic message from November 8 was that people understand their Government is too big and spends too much. This historic Congress is now beginning to clean out the cobwebs left by 40 years of one-party rule. We cannot turn our backs on 40 years of mismanagement overnight, and we cannot turn back those mistakes. But in these first 100 days we will take the necessary first steps, voting on the balanced budget amendment, considering a line item veto, and beginning the hard but necessary work on cutting back on Federal spending.

As the Clinton campaign has been fond of saying, "It's the economy, stupid," Now America has told us, "No, it's the spending, stupid." So let us cut out the stupid spending and balance the budget.

UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning with concern on the much-needed debate on unfunded mandates that is being conducted by the Republican leadership. Everyone agrees in principle that mandates should be paid for. But before we leap, let us look.

I just returned from the California floods. All the talk was about help to bail out the families affected by those floods. When the water recedes, that talk will shift to responsibility. Flood prevention is dependent upon mandates. Think about it, flood plain zoning, flood plain mapping, flood plain building standards.

The Republicans are more interested in having a political victory in the shortest time possible than in good law. We should take time in this session, not the first 8 days, to talk about how the unfunded mandates are going to be carried out. Let us not go too fast, too far, too soon. Allow the public, not just the politicians, to be involved in the debate.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, when our forefathers met in Philadelphia in 1787, their goal was to write a Constitution based on limited government that provided for the current and future needs of our country. But beginning with several Supreme Court decisions in the 1920's and going right up through the present, that concept has been turned on its head. As a result, we have seen the Federal Government grow to almost a quarter of our gross national

product. This is far beyond what the founders could ever have imagined. Fueling this unconstitutional expansion of the size and power of the Federal Government has been deficit spending, which unfairly asks future generations to pay for the Government spending binges of today.

But on January 25, we are going to have a historic opportunity to reestablish constitutional limits on the power of the Federal Government when we vote on the balanced budget amendment. As Thomas Jefferson clearly sought in 1798, "If there is one omission I fear in the document called the Constitution, it is that we did not restrict the power of Government to borrow money." Let us correct that next week.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, over the past years I have supported various versions of the balanced budget amendment. However, I have not been willing to support just any version. After studying all of the proposals that will be coming up next week, I find them deficient in two areas, and I am introducing today an alternative amendment along with the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH]. I should point out it is identical to the contract balanced budget amendment, except for two critical points.

First, it excludes the Social Security trust fund, which our Nation's senior citizens depend on. Second, it does not require a three-fifths vote to raise taxes.

If the House can vote with a simple majority to declare war or for impeachment of a President, we should be able to set tax policy in the same manner. This resolution creates a prudent and viable balance among fiscal responsibility, majority rule, and our responsibility to our fellow Americans.

Please join myself, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], as a cosponsor of this balanced budget resolution.

PACK UP

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

House Democrats, stung by their historic defeat in the last election, have developed a new strategy. If you can't beat them, beat them up.

As a consequence, they have decided to launch a series of bizarre and unfounded allegations about the newly elected Speaker and the Republican majority.

Democrats have done this for a simple reason. They do not want to reform this House.

The American people are not concerned about book deals. They are concerned about the Federal Government's unbalanced books. They don't care about GOPAC. They want big spenders to pack up and go home.

Mr. Speaker, the Contract With America makes the Democrats squirm. They don't want a balanced budget amendment because they want to continue to spend without fear. Democrats don't want unfunded mandates reform because they like telling the American people what to do.

The reason why the Democrats are attacking the Speaker of the House is clear. Republicans want to change the Congress. Democrats want to change the subject.

SLOW DOWN ON UNFUNDED MANDATES LEGISLATION

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider unfunded mandate legislation, H.R. 5. It is a proposal that admittedly has very popular support, and I as a former government official understand what it is about. But I am compelled to ask, what is the rush? The bill will be voted on without the benefit of hearings.

The committee met last week, where people asked a number of questions that were not answered. The sponsors refused to have these questions answered. Yet the committee has been unable to tell us certainly whether this will cover civil rights, how will the disabled be protected, how will environmental laws be protected. In fact, we are yet to define what an unbalanced mandate is.

We need to know these things. Different opinions about the coverage is expected, but certainly we should have a debate. We are going to eliminate the Federal laws that protect health care and clean water. Should you not let people know? I urge that we should not rush without a debate.

CHANGING THE BUSINESS THAT CONGRESS DOES

(Mr. FOX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago a majority of both Democrats and Republicans voted to reform Congress. Now that we have changed the way Congress does business, I am looking forward to, in a bipartisan fashion, changing the business Congress does. The people of this country have become impatient with a government that has grown too big, spends too much, and is an enemy, not a friend, to working Americans.

We are going to prove our commitment to reducing the size and scope of Government by working for the passage of a balanced budget amendment. Every American family knows the importance of living within its means. Congress needs to learn that same discipline, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of the balanced budget amendment.

LEAVE SOME FOR AMERICA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have some problems with the policy that allows Taco Bell to make great profits in America, but requires the taxpayers of America to make a loan to Mexico for Ma Bell to have a shop down there.

Something is wrong here, folks. We have already propped the peso up with \$6 billion with NAFTA. We have lost 40,000 jobs already with NAFTA. Now Mexico wants \$40 billion in loan guarantees so they can become well.

The \$40 billion will not make Mexico well. It will make them more dependent and limping back to Uncle Sam. And I want to advise Members, while you keep worrying about the Mexican economy, you have got people unemployed and you have problems in our own country.

By the way, what do we get for this \$40 billion? Two baseball players to be named later? I think it is time to get on a business program here, folks, stone cold business. And we are losing our pants. Think about that before we go shipping more money now to Mexico. Between Russia, Mexico, and everybody else, it is a wonder there is any program left in America.

VOTE "YES" ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT AND LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Washington I made a commitment to the people of Wisconsin. They expect me to do everything I can to reduce the size and the cost of Government, and I intend to follow through. That is why I support the balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto.

The balanced budget amendment will change Washington. No longer will we be able to fund programs with our children's money. No longer will we be able to spend taxpayer funds without asking if we have the money to do so. The line-item veto allows for the elimination of wasteful Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to change the way we do things here in Washington.

The balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto build a new structure for this Congress to live within. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on both of these important initiatives.

THE SPEAKER'S BOOK DEAL

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker's unbelievably good book deal, after all these secret meetings and behind the scenes deal-making, which each day brings to light new and more startling revelations, I am still not satisfied with the answers I am getting about this very large and lucrative deal our Speaker has negotiated for himself.

Now more than ever before the perception of impropriety, not to mention the potential conflict of interest, still exists and cannot be ignored.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the gentlewoman's words be taken down.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. She should not approach the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is well taken.

Members should not approach the Speaker during the Clerk's report and the Chair's ruling.

□ 1120

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The Clerk will read the gentlewoman's words.

The Clerk read as follows:

News accounts tell us that while the Speaker may have given up the \$4.5 million advance, he stands to gain that amount and much more. That is a whole lot of dust where I come from. If anything now, how much the Speaker earns has grown much more dependent on how hard his publishing house hawks his book.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Speaker's opinion that innuendo and critical references to the Speaker's personal conduct are not in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VOLKMER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is the Speaker now saying it is the ruling of the Chair that any statements as to activity, whether it is illegal or not, by the Speaker of the House in his private actions cannot be brought to the floor of this House? Is that the Chair's ruling? It appears that it is.

Mr. LINDER. Point of order.

Mr. VOLKMER. I appeal the ruling of the Chair. I want to know what the ruling of the Chair is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In answer to the gentleman's question, first, it has been the Chair's ruling, and the precedents of the House support this, a

proper level of respect is due to the Speaker.

Does the gentleman appeal the Chair's ruling?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. LINDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LINDER moves to lay the Volkmer motion on the table.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk repeat the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 169, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—214

Allard	Creameans	Hoke
Archer	Cubin	Horn
Armey	Cunningham	Hostettler
Bachus (AL)	Davis	Houghton
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hunter
Baker (LA)	Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson
Ballenger	Dickey	Inglis
Barr	Doolittle	Istook
Barrett (NE)	Dornan	Johnson (CT)
Bartlett	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Duncan	Jones
Bass	Dunn	Kasich
Bateman	Ehlers	Kelly
Bereuter	Emerson	Kim
Billbray	English	King
Billirakis	Ensign	Kingston
Bliley	Everett	Klug
Blute	Ewing	Knollenberg
Boehlert	Fawell	Kolbe
Boehner	Fields (TX)	LaHood
Bonilla	Foley	Largent
Bono	Forbes	Latham
Brownback	Fowler	LaTourette
Bryant (TN)	Fox	Lazio
Bunn	Franks (CT)	Leach
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Burton	Funderburk	Lightfoot
Buyer	Gallely	Linder
Callahan	Ganske	Livingston
Calvert	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Camp	Gilman	Longley
Canady	Goodling	Lucas
Castle	Goss	Manzullo
Chabot	Graham	Martini
Chambliss	Greenwood	McCollum
Chenoweth	Gunderson	McCrery
Christensen	Hancock	McDade
Chrysler	Hansen	McInnis
Clinger	Hastert	McIntosh
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Coburn	Hayworth	Metcalf
Collins (GA)	Hefley	Meyers
Combest	Heineman	Mica
Cooley	Herger	Miller (FL)
Cox	Hilleary	Molinar
Crane	Hobson	Moorhead
Crapo	Hoekstra	Morrell